

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed on November 27, 2008, the Examiner allowed claims 2-5 and 7-20 and rejected claims 21-30. In particular, claims 21-23, 25, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly lacking utility. Claims 21-30 were rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,119,098 to *Guyot et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,197 to *d'Eon et al.* By this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled claims 21-30 and added new claims 31-38. Claims 2-5, 7-20, and 31-38 are currently pending.

Section 101 Rejections

Claims 21-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly lacking "patentable utility." 11/27/07 Final Office Action, p. 5. Although Applicants disagree, these rejections are now moot because Applicants have cancelled claims 21-30 by this Amendment.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 21-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Guyot et al.* in view of *d'Eon et al.* Although Applicants disagree, these rejections are now moot because Applicants have cancelled claims 21-30.

New Claims 31-38

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new claims 31-38, which are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by *Guyot et al.* or *d'Eon et al.* New claim 31 recites a computer-implemented method for optimizing placement of Internet advertisements comprising, among other things, "computing a click probability estimate representing a

likelihood that the customer will select the Internet advertisement according to the category attributes and the product attributes" and "determining a strength of the click probability estimate based on a number of times the Internet advertisement has been previously presented." After the Internet advertisement is presented to the customer and a response is received from the customer, the method of claim 31 recites "adjusting the click probability estimate for the Internet advertisement based on the received response to the Internet advertisement" and "increasing the strength of the click probability estimate based on the presentation of the Internet advertisement.." These elements are not taught by *Guyot et al.* or *d'Eon et al.* Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine or modify these references to achieve the methods recited in claim 31 and its dependent claims 32-38.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the continued examination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Please grant any additional extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 23, 2008

By: William J. Brogan, Reg. #43,515
for Erika H. Arner BROGAN
Reg. No. 57,540